

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

Claim 8 is objected to because of a suspected typographical error. Applicant appreciates that the Examiner recognized this typographical error and interpreted appropriately. This error has been corrected by amendment.

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16 and 19 of copending application 11/112,965. Applicant defers action on this provisional rejection until at least one of the claims involved issues. At that point, if a terminal disclaimer is necessary, Applicant will revisit the issue.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,038,012 to Bley in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002-0191082 to Fujino et al. ("Fujino").

Claim 1

The combined teachings of Bley and Fujino do not suggest a computer integrated into the camera stand of a capture station in combination with the other elements of claim 1. Neither Bley nor Fujino teach or suggest this structure.

Moreover, there is insufficient motivation to combine Bley and Fujino to make the capture station of claim 1. While Fujino teaches a networked camera, Bley teaches away from integrating a networked camera into a capture station because it teaches a photo ID production system that is intended to be self-contained and is not intended to be operated under the control of a remote workstation.

Paragraph 9 of Fujino, the passage cited in support of the reason to combine the teachings of Fujino and Bley, highlights problems associated with attempting to share a camera, and therefore, does not provide adequate teaching to one of skill in the art to lead him or her to modify the teachings of Bley to include the claimed network interface program and camera control program. Moreover, the Office contends that these elements are merely inherent in the cited art, which further detracts from the adequacy of the teachings of Bley and Fujino and the motivation to combine them.

Claim 2

Applicants respectfully disagree that the claimed camera control program, which controls the lighting device under commands from a remote workstation, is well known in the art. While the flash may be known, the remote control of it through a camera control program is not. As noted, Bley is silent regarding this aspect of the claim, and the Official Notice needs further substantiation because it has not provided a sufficient showing that this aspect of the claim is known in the art.

Claim 3

Claim 3 is amended to clarify that the signature capture control program is also controlled from the remote workstation via the network interface program. The cited references fail to teach or suggest this aspect of the claim.

Claim 4

Claim 4 is amended to clarify that the fingerprint capture control program is also controlled from the remote workstation via the network interface program. The cited references fail to teach or suggest this aspect of the claim.

Dependent Claims 5-8

Dependent claims 5-8 are patentable over Bley and Fujino for the same reasons as base claim 1. Therefore, further distinctions are not elaborated here.

Claim 9

The combined teachings of Bley and Fujino fail to teach all of the elements of claim 9. For example, the combined teachings fail to suggest the claimed interaction between a first computer workstation where part of the applicant data entry occurs (e.g., a user interface that enables an operator to enter applicant data and control capture of image information) and a second station where other applicant data is captured (e.g., the all in one capture station that captures an applicant portrait). There is no motivation to combine the references because Bley's self contained system teaches away from the claimed distributed processing on two different stations.

Dependent Claims 10-12

Dependent claims 10-12 are patentable for the same reasons as the base claim and include additional elements that distinguish them from the cited art. Claim 10, for example, recites “wherein the all in one capture station controls one or more additional biometric capture devices that are controllable via network connections....” Fujino is cited as teaching this aspect of claim 10, yet Fujino does not teach a system in which two or more capture devices, including biometric capture devices, are included within a station and controllable via network connections as claimed. Therefore, the combined teachings do not render this claim obvious.

Claim 13

None of the cited references teach or disclose the camera stand having a base and slidably attached tower, along with a computer integrated into the base. Therefore, even when combined, the cited art fails to teach all of the elements of claim 13, and does not render the claim obvious.

Claim 14

Claim 14 recites elements not taught or suggested in the cited art, including for example, the application programming interface enabling programmatic control of a camera and a biometric capture device.

Date: June 12, 2006


CUSTOMER NUMBER 23735

Phone: 503-469-4800

FAX 503-469-4777

Respectfully submitted,

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

By 
Joel R. Meyer
Registration No. 37,677